



From: genesee@transportationchoices.org
To: [Columbia River Crossing](#);
CC:
Subject: Comment from CRC DraftEIS Comments Page
Date: Wednesday, July 02, 2008 12:00:58 AM
Attachments:

Home Zip Code: 98104

Work Zip Code: 98104

Person:

Other - statewide nonprofit organization

Person commutes in the travel area via:

1. In Support of the following bridge options:

No Opinion

2. In Support of the following High Capacity Transit options:

Light Rail between Vancouver and Portland

3. Support of Bus Rapid Transit or Light Rail by location:

Lincoln Terminus: No Opinion

Kiggins Bowl Terminus: No Opinion

Mill Plain (MOS) Terminus: No Opinion

Clark College (MOS) Terminus: No Opinion

Contact Information:

First Name: Genesee

Last Name: Adkins

Title: State Policy Director

E-Mail: genesee@transportationchoices.org

Address: 811 1st Ave. Suite 626

Seattle, WA 98104

Comments:

July 1, 2008

To Whom It May Concern:

Transportation Choices Coalition recognizes the substantial amount of work the project team has put into studying how to address transportation problems associated with crossing the Columbia River between Portland and Vancouver and producing a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) that analyzes four build alternatives and a no-build alternative for the proposed Columbia River Crossing (CRC).

Environmentally sound and efficient transportation options are important for all travelers crossing the river. In particular, alternative transportation modes and freight movement need to be addressed. In short, we agree that both states have a large stake in making safety and seismic improvements to the bridge, improving freight mobility, and providing citizens with reasonable access to the places they need and want to go.

Given that the transportation sector is responsible for about 38% of Oregon's greenhouse gas emissions and about 50% of Washington's greenhouse gas emissions, any future transportation investments must put both states on a path toward real progress in reducing climate change and carbon emissions. Doing anything less could have wide repercussions for our region's future livability and our ability to achieve our respective states' adopted greenhouse gas reduction goals.

We would like the project team to take the following steps in moving forward with the EIS:

A new analysis of traffic demand in the corridor, taking into account the long-term decline in projected trips that could result from the continuing increase in international fuel prices. If fewer auto trips are expected, fewer lanes can be built.

The Bridge Influence Area should be expanded so that decision makers have a better understanding of the relationship between this project and other bottlenecks in the region.

A more in-depth analysis of the air quality impacts of the project is warranted. While the DEIS notes that none of the alternatives being proposed are expected to violate federal or state standards for criteria air pollutants or hazardous air pollutants, scientific evidence is growing that air pollution harms people at levels even lower than the current federal maximum allowable levels and that air pollutants do not act in isolation, but rather cumulatively. It is important to the health of residents of the region and to those who live in close proximity to I-5, in particular, that we choose the project design resulting in the least amount of air pollution. This is an environmental justice issue as well as a health issue given that the project is located near neighborhoods with a high proportion of lower-income residents and people of color. OEC therefore encourages project design that foresees and adheres to even stricter federal standards. Lower maximum allowable levels are likely to be adopted in coming years because of emerging scientific evidence.

We would like to see a more thorough analysis of how freight mobility will be improved with a refigured corridor. Goods movement is essential to the region's economy, but inefficiencies in the system are impacting our climate and harming our environment. Nationally, freight movement is responsible for approximately 20% of the transportation sector's CO2 emissions.

Use of a peak period variable pricing model, applied to both the I-5 and I-205 bridges in advance of building additional lane capacity.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments and for your ongoing leadership on this important transportation project. We look forward to continuing to work with you to develop a Columbia River Crossing project design that meets both states' environmental, economic, mobility and community goals.

Sincerely,

Genesee C. Adkins
State Policy Director
Transportation Choices Coalition